

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,406	10/29/2003	Russell W. Guenthner	52003218 7204	
7590 03/31/2006			EXAMINER	
Bull HN Information Systems Inc.			SIEK, VUTHE	
13430 North Bla Phoenix, AZ 8	ack Canyon Highway 35029-1310		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1.100.11.1, 1.12 00005 1010			2825	
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006	DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	•
Λ.	ı

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/697,406	GUENTHNER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vuthe Siek	2825	

Advisory Action	10/697,406	GUENTHNER ET A	L.		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Vuthe Siek	2825			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP					
I.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);			
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in below</li> </ul>		ducing or cimplifying	the issues for		
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	110 133003 101		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	•		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		timely filed amondme	ont concoling the		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	nowable il submitted in a separate,	umery med amendme	in canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	it or other evidence is	s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but the reconsideration has been considered by the recons	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:		
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)			
13. Other:					
	V	UTHE SIEK			

PRIMARY EXAMINER

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims and added new claim overcome the rejection under 103 per combined references to Rahut and Chen. However, Examiner needed further consideration and/or search in order to determine the patentability of the claims present.

2

VUTHE SIEK